

Messages to the Policy Advisory Committee (from post-it notes)

All post-it notes comments are included below. They are categorized by subject.

SRFB policy

- What is the SRFB policy for funding non-anadromous (ESA-listed) projects (i.e. in blocked area above Grand Coulee)?
- How should Lead Entities address prioritizing non-listed (ESA) species stocks and areas or projects that benefit those stocks? How does the Technical Panel prioritize these species/projects?
- SRFB should develop a statewide strategy with priorities by region or LE area.

Tech Panel Role

- SRFB should consider hiring a dedicated Technical Panel staff so that they can really focus on their job.
- If there is a big difference in opinion between the local TAG and the Technical Panel, SRFB should defer to local TAG to respect local process and intent of Salmon Recovery Act.
- The Technical Panel should no longer be prevented from project site visits. This is very important for gaining a good understanding of projects.
- What is the Technical Panel's role regarding strategies – guidance or judgment? Clearly inform LEs as Panel's role evolves.
- How can we avoid the situation where the Technical Panel's disagreement with local rationale results in disagreement on rating/priority? Would better benefit/certainty definitions help? Opportunity for Technical Panel input/advice prior to finalization.

Socio-economic/community issues

- SRFB should develop a better method for determining local community support of projects. This should receive as much consideration as input from Technical Panel.
- What is the role of the citizen committee in the process of project selection? Improve integration of citizen committee effort with the Technical Panel process.
- There was a lot of talk by the Technical Panel of the need to integrate projects that may have a lot of community support but that are of lower biological importance. How does the Technical Panel propose to deal with such projects? Do they only want to see projects that meet a "minimum threshold" (i.e. medium benefit to salmon and medium certainty of success) or will they defer to the local strategy in such cases? I imagine it will be difficult to defend the technical merits of such projects to the Technical Panel.

LE Strategies

- Who approves the LE strategies?
- Would it be more effective to add detail about how individual projects fit into the strategy and how citizens groups rank projects due to socio-economic concerns instead of changing strategies year to year to explain your project list?
- Habitat connection over habitat protection.
- How can the SFLO most effectively integrate its mandate (SHB109S) to fix SFL fish passage barriers into LE strategies?
- Reconcile project- versus watershed-scale (project patchwork versus portfolio). NOAA, UW, PSNRP framework versus "core/priority areas."

- Policy should clearly articulate whether an EDT-like reach strategic based approach is an option or the only recommended approach. Some areas may choose other strategic approaches – what about them?

Parallel/related planning efforts

- Will the SRFB honor state-certified recovery plans that some LEs will have in place in a couple of years?
- Improve integration/coordination with parallel plans (e.g. watersheds).
- Relationship between habitat recovery and salmon recovery.
- How do VSP citizens and SRFB strategies fit together? Clarify how all pieces fit together.
- In 1998 the Legislature told LEs to create habitat restoration strategies. In 2003, the Legislature passed a Bill authorizing a task force to develop a strategy for estuary areas. How do the two legislatively-mandated strategies relate?
- How will recent decisions on the validity of the 2000 Biological Opinion impact the creation of subbasin plans and their inclusion in/as the bases for state recovery plans?

Accountability

- There is pressure to monitor what LEs do. We need an understanding of what that means at the LE level. Who is going to do it?
- How should the Technical Panel and/or SRFB review the ability of LEs to implement funded projects in a timely manner (i.e. accountability)? Completing projects in a timely manner helps to secure future funding.
- Reward successful LEs.

Clarify criteria

- Cost versus benefit.
- LEs need clearer representation of SRFB criteria for rating projects in order to develop a parallel system of ranking projects.

Funding

- Reveal funding caps in advance.
- One grant cycle per biennium.
- Should the timing for Cycle Funding be extended? Depends on who you ask. Yes, LEs could use more time. No, project proponents are becoming comfortable with cycle timing and may be frustrated with more change.

Miscellaneous

- How do we address the irony of salmon recovery discussion and decision while sitting in a windowless room in a large urban center while an investment seminar drones in the adjacent room?
- What is the difference between LE and LE coordinator?